P1009 (12498RRUS01U)   PATENT

2661
4/1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: WU, Geng

Serial No.:   09/699,196

Filed: October 27, 2000

For: IP Adaptation Layer on Backhaul Connection of Cellular Network

Group Art Unit: 2661

Examiner: Phirin Sam

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Arlington, Virginia 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO FIRST OFFICE ACTION

In response to the First Office Action mailed July 21, 2004, the Applicant

respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the following Response.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being deposited with the United States Postal Service
with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA
22313-1450.

Date: October 19, 2004   Amy Kasper
                                          Amy Kasper

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

The Examiner rejected independent claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, 15, 17, 19, 20, 27, 29, 31, 32, 36, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,751,207 to Lee et al (hereafter "the '207 Lee Patent"). Claims 2, 4, 7-9, 16, 16, 18, 21, 22, 28, 30, and 33-35 were rejected allegedly obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in further view of U.S. Patent 6,049,543 to Sauer et al (hereafter "the '543 Sauer Patent"). Claims 12-14, 24-26, and 38-40 were also rejected under § 103(a) in view of the '207 Patent and U.S. Patent 6,230,012 to Willkie et al (hereafter "the '012 Willkie Patent").

Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 15, and 27 to overcome the rejection under § 102(e). Dependent Claim 36 has also been amended in light of the amendment to Claim 27 to expand the additional limitation to amended Claim 27. The independent claims have also been amended to correspond with the terminology used in the specification. Accordingly, the Applicant believes the Examiner's rejection will be traversed by the following Response, and the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims in light of the following Response.